REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed April 30, 2008, Applicant provides the following. Claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 13 and 18 have been amended without adding new matter. Thirty (30) claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-30. Reconsideration of claims 1-30 in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that this amendment is timely submitted because the date of submission, Tuesday, September 2, 2008, is the first business day following the day of expiration of the one-month extension of the period for reply, Saturday, August 30, 2008.

By way of this amendment, Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (949) 932-3181 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

1.   Claims 1, 11 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,961,139 (Kita et al.).

Regarding claim 1, Kita does not teach at least "a reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document sheets are independently read by the image reading unit until a read-end command is input, and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets; an image outputting unit configured to collectively output the plural sets of document sheets stored in the image storage unit as the series of image data when the read-end command is input; and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document

sheets in the successive reading operation" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

The present invention enables image data corresponding to the read image data to be displayed on a display unit after reading each set of the document sheets, so that a user can confirm the image data even in the middle of the successive reading operation.

The image-forming apparatus in the cited reference, Kita, reads a plurality of pages of a document by a scanning section and transmits the read image data to a hard-disk of an information processing apparatus. Then the information processing apparatus displays the images on a monitor section based on the image data read from the hard-disk (Kita, col. 8, lines 6-32 and 59-65).

However, Kita only describes that the image-forming apparatus reads a set of documents on the document tray, transmits the read set of documents to the information processing apparatus and completes the document reading (col. 8, lines 6-32), but does not suggest features of our invention that the image-forming apparatus reads plural sets of document sheets independently until a read-end command is input and stores the read plural sets of document sheets into an image storage unit as a series of image data. Therefore, Kita is not related to a successive reading operation.

Further, Kita does not describe that the plural set of document sheets, which has been stored in the storage unit as the series of image data, is output collectively, when the read-end command is input.

Accordingly, Kita never teaches that in the successive reading operation, image data corresponding to the read image data can be displayed on a display unit after reading each set of the document sheets.

MPEP 2131 states "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Kita does not teach at least "a reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a series of document sheets are independently read by the image reading unit until a read-

end command is input, and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets; an image outputting unit configured to collectively output the plural sets of document sheets stored in the image storage unit as the series of image data when the read-end command is input; and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document sheets in the successive reading operation," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 are dependent from claim 1, thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 2-10 is overcome and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 11 has been amended substantially as claim 1 has been amended; thus, the comments above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claim 11. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 11 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 12-30 are dependent from claim 11, thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 12-30 is overcome and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependency on claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

2.   Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, 27, 28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kita in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,980,702 (Michiie et al.).

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, 27, 28 and 30 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, which have been shown above not to be anticipated by Kita. Michiie provides no further teaching regarding the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the proposed combination of Kita and Michiie does not render obvious the invention recited in claims 1 or 11. Thus, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 11, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, 27, 28 and 30 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

3.   Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kita in view of Michiie in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,212,307 (Kanda).

Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, which have been shown above not to be anticipated by Kita. Neither Michiie nor Kanda provide further teaching regarding the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the proposed combination of Kita, Michiie and Kanda does not render obvious the invention recited in claims 1 or 11. Thus, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 11, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

September 2, 2008

Date

___/casey r. huffmire/___

Casey R. Huffmire, Reg. No. 60,085
Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: 949-932-3181
Fax: 949-932-3560